


New claims 8-11 are directed to the same invention as original claims 1-7, the same invention being illustrated in both Figs. 12 and 13. According to the specification, Fig. 12 illustrates a flowchart showing the operation of a YC circuit, and Fig. 13 illustrates a flowchart showing a subroutine (i.e., step S12-1 of Fig. 12) of the same YC circuit (see page 8 and paragraphs [0047]-[0056] of substitute specification filed on August 16, 2007). Thus, it is evident that the steps illustrated in Fig. 13 and the steps illustrated in Fig. 12 (i.e., S12-1) are steps directed to the same YC circuit.

Therefore, it is clear that it cannot be said that new claims 8-11 are directed to an invention distinct and independent from the invention previously claimed in claims 1-7, because claims 1-7 and claims 8-11 are directed to the same invention, aspects of which are illustrated in both Figs. 12 and 13. Thus, 37 CFR 1.145 is not applicable to the above-mentioned claims because the claims are directed to the same invention. Furthermore, there would be no basis for restricting the new claims since the above-mentioned claims are directed to the same invention, and it cannot be said that new claims 8-11 are not directed to the same prosecuted invention.

For the reasons discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that original claims 1-7 and new claims 8-11 are directed to the same prosecuted invention. Thus, for the reasons discussed above, it is submitted that the amendment filed on August 16, 2007 is responsive to the outstanding Office Action.

Respectfully submitted,

Yoshimasa OKABE

By: 
Andrew L. Dunlap
Registration No. 60,554
Attorney for Applicant

ALD(NEP)/nrj
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
December 17, 2007